

REMARKS

Response is made to the Final Office Action dated July 9, 2007. We request continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. By this response, numerous claims have been amended, claims 42-50 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 51-56 have been added. Claims 1-41 and 51-56 (48 total claims, including 3 independent claims) remain pending.

The final office action requests clarification of the differences between our claimed inventions and the information described in WIPO Publication No. WO 01/26335 A2 (“Gelvin”). We request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action because the Gelvin reference, taken alone or in combination with any of the lesser references cited in the Final Office Action, fails to anticipate or suggest each and every aspect of our claimed inventions.

That is, no reference describes a communicating node that has both an internode physical layer and a separate wireless network physical layer that share a common antenna that is capable of directional internode communications as well as wireless network broadcasts. More particularly, no reference taken alone or in combination is able to disclose or suggest at least our claimed feature of *a common directional antenna coupled to both the internode physical layer and the wireless network physical layer via antenna management logic, wherein the antenna management logic is configured to direct the common antenna to transmit an internode radio frequency signal only in the direction of another of the plurality of nodes and to direct the common antenna to broadcast a wireless network signal to the one or more wireless devices*. Claim 51 further recites that the node includes an RFID physical layer that also shares the common antenna. Support for the newly-added language in our claims can be found in our Specification as originally filed, particularly at FIG. 4 and the accompanying text.

While Gelvin does describe a networked node that is capable of sensing environmental feature, the reference does not describe the sharing of a common antenna between multiple physical layers, and certainly does not disclose the use of antenna management logic as now recited in each of our claims. To the contrary, the Gelvin nodes merely communicate using a single wireless protocol. To the limited extent that

multiple forms of communication are available to the Gelvin nodes, only a single wireless protocol is described, with additional communications provided by hardwired Ethernet or serial (RS-232) connections. Indeed, Gelvin is greatly concerned about power management and simplicity; it makes no mention of nodes that are able to communicating using more than one wireless technique, much less able to share a common antenna between different physical layers.

We therefore request reconsideration of the Section 102 and 103 rejections based upon the Gelvin reference, as Gelvin does not describe each and every aspect of our current claims. None of the other references of record are alleged to contain the features of our claims that are not found in the Gelvin reference, and in fact none of the references currently of record disclose the features discussed above. As a result, a detailed review of the other references would be cumulative (and therefore unnecessary) at this point. Similarly, because each of the independent claims contain novel features, there is no present need to discuss the additional features found in the dependent claims. We reserve the right to point out additional features of our various claims and/or to address further shortcomings of the prior art in a later response or, if necessary, on appeal.

In view of the foregoing, we respectfully submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or otherwise wish to discuss any aspect of this Response, we would welcome a telephone call to Applicant's counsel at (480) 385-5060.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated October 9, 2007

By: /BRETT A. CARLSON/
Reg. No. 39,938
(480) 385-5060